

The Examiner objected to the specification, the claims and the drawing, and Applicant has amended accordingly. Therefore, removal of such objection/rejection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The Examiner further pointed out several specific places improper in claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 8 and 10-15. Applicant has amended such corresponding claims by either deleting such improper descriptions or adding more detailed descriptions for clearly defining the claimed structures, wherein additives are all substantially supported by the specification originally submitted. No new matter is added thereto. Removal of such rejection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Muzslay (4,618,196). Applicant appreciated the Examiner's detailed illustration regarding reasons of rejection in each corresponding claim.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to include (1) a pair of side arms extending rearward from two opposite ends of the main body of the connector and (2) both of the connectors being commonly mounted on a same mother board. The Muzslay reference only discloses an adaptor having two opposite ports with internal circuits connected therebetween, thus disclosing no any elements of the aforementioned structure (1) and (2) of the amended claim

1. Moreover, the amended claim 1 further in detail describes the relative structural relationship between these two connectors by means of extension of the side arms instead of the originally presented ambiguous "a head-to-head state" definition.

Accordingly, claim 1 as amended is believed to be patentably distinguish over the Muzslay reference and is in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 2-7 incorporate the foregoing structure by reason of their dependency upon claim 1 and thus are also believed in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-7 are respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng et al. (5,514,002) in view of Coteus et al. (5,688,147). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In Coteus, even though the keys (15) may rotatably installed within the corresponding key openings (10) for compliance with variant different cards, such variation is still minor. The main general distance between the key and the center line of the connector should be regarded still same. All the different cards should be installed into the connector in the same orientation. It is impossible to have the card inserted into the connector in a reverse manner because under a reverse installation of the card to the connector, the general positions of the key of the

connector and the notch of the card will be far away from each other and thus they can not comply with each other.

In opposite, claim 8 clearly defines the reverse type application of the card with the connector, which is not disclosed and is impossible in the Coteus et al. reference. Claim 8 is believed patentable over the Coteus et al reference. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 8 and its dependent claim 9 are respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claim 10-17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng et al. (5,514,002) in view of Coteus et al (5,688,147) and Dodds (4,295,695). The Examiner further indicated Applicant to revise the claims so that the pad location on the card and their disclosed manner of use would define over the cited references.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended claims 10, 11, 13, 14 and 15 to clearly illustrate the specific relationship between the pad of the card and the corresponding contact of the connector. None of the references including the Dodds reference, disclose or suggest this manner. In fact, the Dodds reference only generally discloses a flexible substrate (10) having two contact areas (12) for respectively engaging two strips (11). No specific relationship as defined in claims 10-17 is taught or disclosed. Claims 10-17 are believed to patentably distinguish over the

cited references. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims 10-17 are respectfully requested.

Applicant has added claims 18 and 19, which are respectively dependent from the claims 14 and 15, for further defining the relative structures, and are believed to be patentable by reason of their dependency upon the patentable claims.

Applicant has made an earnest and sincere effort to place the application in condition for formal allowance. Applicant respectfully requested reconsideration, allowance and passage to issuance of the claims as amended.

Respectfully submitted,

Choy



Edmond Choy

P.O. Address: 930 W. Maude Ave., Sunnyvale, CA 94086

Caesar Chen 08-18-98
Caesar Chen

P.O. Address: 930 W. Maude Ave., Sunnyvale, CA 94086